

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 09/831,792 | 10/18/2001 | Guillaume Royer | S1022/8246 | 9624 |
| 23628 | 7590 05/07/2003 | | | |
| WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC | | | EXAMINER | |
| FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2211 | | • | LE, UYEN CHAU | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2876 | - · |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Office Action Summany | 09/831,792 | ROYER, GUILLAUME | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Uyen-Chau N. Le | 2876 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND | be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 J | lanuary 2003 . | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th | is action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)⊡ Some * c)⊡ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro | ovisional application has beer | n received. | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1 | 5) Notice of Info | nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 29 January 2003.

Specification

2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-6 and 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orihara et al (US 5,705,852) in view of Akram (US 5,723,907).

Re claims 1-6 and 8, Orihara et al discloses an electronic circuit including a planar base1, an antenna 2 attached on a first surface on the base1; and a chip 6 connected to the antenna 2 by connection wires 9 (figs. 5A & 5B), or by connecting bumps [6a, 6b] and connecting terminals [2a, 2b] followed by heating, which serves a welding beads; characterized in that a double faced adhesive 5 is glued on one of the base surfaces; and wherein the base 1 is formed of polyester film, which is flexible (fig. 1b; col. 3, lines 45+).

Art Unit: 2876

Orihara fails to teach or fairly suggest that the chip being arranged at least partially in a slot made in the double faced adhesive, and the chip and the wires being covered with a drop of resin.

Akram teaches in fig. 2 a semiconductor die 32 is attached to a slot/recess 30, which is sized and shaped to receive the semiconductor die 32, by a double side/faced adhesive 34 (col. 5, lines 9-42).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Akram into the teachings of Orihara et al in order to provide Orihara with a better protection of the chip/IC module from the outside environment. Furthermore, such modification would provide Orihara et al with a more feasible system due to the shortening of the length of the chip connecting wires as taught by Akram (col. 5, lines 24+). Accordingly, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Orihara et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

5. Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orihara et al as modified by Akram as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hara et al (US 4,727,246). The teachings of Orihara et al as modified by Akram have been discussed above.

Re claim 7, Orihara et al/Akram disclosed the chip 6 connected to the antenna 2 by, but fails to teach or fairly suggest the surface of the base, which does not receive the double faced adhesive is provided to receive printing of a pattern of a text or of a code.

Hara et al teaches the above limitation with the surface of the base, which does not receive the double faced adhesive is provided to receive printing of a pattern of a code 41 (figs. 6 & 12; col. 8, lines 40+).

Art Unit: 2876

Ł

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hara et al into the teachings of Orihara et al/Akram in order to provide Orihara et al/Akram with a more secure system wherein each card has its unique identification code (e.g., a holder code, etc.). Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious engineer design variations for aesthetic and security purposes, in which the card appearance is covered with pattern of a text, such as the holder's name and the service name, etc., thus the name of the card's holder can be recognized readily just by looking its cover, preventing fraudulent use in the event of lost/stolen/misplaced.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Newly cited reference to Akram (US 5,723,907) was used to further meet the limitation of the claimed invention.

7. In response to the Applicant's argument that the Abstract resides on page 8 of the application (p. 2, last paragraph), the examiner respectfully disagrees, wherein the examiner has gone through the application several times and it appeared that only 6 pages (excluding the drawings) are presented in the pending application. As the Applicant directed, the examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to submit the two (2) missing pages in the next communication.

Art Unit: 2876

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Scheuenpflug (DE 4,232,625 A1) and Freyman et al (US 5,859,475) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a self-adhesive electronic circuit.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on SUN, M, W, F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

UU_ Uyen -Chau Ngo Le

April 25, 2003

DIANE I. LEE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Dean In he

Page 5